25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8		
9	VALLAVISTA CORPORATION, a	No. C 07-05360 WHA
10	California corporation,	No. C 10-00120 JW
11	Plaintiff,	1101 0 10 001200 11
12	v.	ORDER DECLINING TO
13 14	AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation, TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation, <i>et al.</i> ,	RELATE CASES
15	Defendants.	
16	VALLAVISTA CORPORATION, a California corporation,	
17		
18	Plaintiff,	
19	v.	
20	VERA BRADLEY DESIGNS, INC., an Indiana corporation, DIZENGOFF	
21	HANDBAGS, INC., a New York corporation, and TONY PEROTTI ITALY (USA) LLC,	
22		
23	Defendants.	
24		

Under Civil Local Rule 3-12, actions are related when two requirements are met: (1) the actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event, and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges.

Here, it is obvious that the plaintiff is identical in both actions. Also true is the fact that		
the protected mark — the "TAXI WALLET" trademark — asserted in the new action was also		
asserted in the earlier litigation. Beyond these similarities, however, the disputes are hardly		
related under the Civil Local Rules. First, the accused defendants and products in the new action		
are different. In a trademark infringement dispute, even minor differences between accused		
products can sway the merits of an infringement claim. Second, the earlier action has long since		
been dismissed pursuant to stipulation. As such, there is no risk of any duplication of labor. All		
the work in the new case will have to be done, and different witnesses, products, and defendants		
are now being targeted by plaintiff Vallavista Corporation.		

In sum, while the trademark at issue may be the same, that alone does not render these cases related under Civil Local Rule 3-12(a). For the reasons explained above, the administrative motion to relate these cases is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2010.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE